

**REMARKS**

The Examiner objected to claims 8-12 and 20 for minor informalities. In response, Applicants have amended claims 8-12 and 20, without adding new matter, to correct these errors noted by the Examiner. However, Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's assertion that dependent claim 12 fails to further limit the subject matter of its independent claim 7. Specifically, the Examiner assumes that the distance between the optically transmissive member and the reflective surface must necessarily be equal to the distance between the first and second edges of the wiper blade. Claim 7, however, does not require any such limitation. Claim 7 calls out only that the reflective surface extending from the base is spaced from the optically transmissive member, and only that the first and second edges of the wiper blade contact the reflective surface and the optically transmissive member, respectively. Claim 7 says nothing about distances. Claim 12 covers one specific embodiment of the present invention where these two distances are equal, and thus, defines a spatial relationship that is not included in claim 7. Therefore, claim 12 further limits claim 7. As such, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the objection.

Turning now to the rejections, the Examiner rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Buchanan in view of Morinaga. Applicants respectfully disagree. Claim 1 is directed to a device that prevents toner from leaking from a cartridge. The device comprises, "a base extending outward from [a] seal ... and a reflector extending from the base and having a reflective surface positioned a distance from the optically transmissive member." The Examiner admits that Buchanan fails to teach or suggest a base extending outwardly from a seal. Thus, Buchanan also necessarily fails to teach or suggest a reflective member extending from a base. Buchanan discloses only that some portion of the toner chamber (i.e.,

the back or bottom of the chamber) physically supports the reflective surface. *Buchanan*, col. 2, II. 56-59.

Morinaga, like Buchanan, fails to teach or suggest the requisite reflector extending from the base. In Morinaga, a removable cap having cross-shaped projections seals an opening in a toner cartridge. *Morinaga*, col. 15, II. 65-67. To remove the cap from the opening, the user must employ a tool to cut the cross-shaped projections. *Morinaga*, col. 16, II. 3-5. The user then grabs the projections with the tool to cause the cap to release from the inner wall of the cartridge. *Morinaga*, FIGS. 32A-B. Morinaga says nothing about a reflective member extending from a base. In fact, Morinaga says nothing about a reflector at all. This is not surprising because the configuration of the Morinaga cap necessarily precludes its use with a reflective member. Specifically, the cross-shaped projections extending across the cap necessarily prevent light from passing from a source to a reflective member. *Morinaga*, FIG. 8, C1; FIGS. 32A-B. As such, no one skilled in the art would be motivated to modify a transparent window that specifically allows for the passage of light with a cap that would prevent the passage of light. Therefore, neither Buchanan nor Morinaga, alone or in combination, teach or suggest claim 1, or any of its dependent claims 2-6.

The Examiner also rejected claims 7 and 13 under §103(a) as being unpatentable over Buchanan in view of Morinaga. However, both claims 7 and 13 contain language similar to that of claim 1. Therefore, for the reasons stated above, neither Buchanan nor Morinaga, alone or in combination, teach or suggest independent claims 7 or 13, or any of their respective dependent claims 8-12 and 14-16.

The Examiner also rejected claim 17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Morinaga in view of Buchanan. Claim 17 is directed to a method of removing a plug from a toner cartridge, and comprises “forming a hole in an optically transmissive section of a plug that is mounted within a port in the cartridge.” The Examiner admits that Morinaga does not teach or

suggest the claimed optically transmissive section, but cites Buchanan in an attempt to correct this deficiency. Buchanan shows a transparent window mounted to the cartridge, but does not disclose forming a hole in the transparent window to remove the transparent window from the cartridge. In fact, Buchanan says nothing at all about how a user might remove the transparent window, or if it is even desirable to remove the transparent window. Thus, neither of the references teaches or suggests this element of claim 17.

In addition, the Morinaga cap is not suitable for modification as the Examiner contends. As stated above, Morinaga uses cross projections formed in the middle of the cap that are necessary to remove the cap from the cartridge. Modifying the cap of Morinaga to allow light to pass through the cap would necessarily require removing the cross-projections. This, however, would render the Morinaga cap unusable for its intended purpose.

Simply put, neither reference teaches or suggests, alone or in combination, claim 17 or any of its dependent claims 18-19. Accordingly, the §103 rejection of claim 17 fails as a matter of law.

In light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request the allowance of all pending claims.

Respectfully submitted,

COATS & BENNETT, P.L.L.C.



David D. Kalish  
Registration No.: 42,706

Dated: October 11, 2005

P.O. Box 5  
Raleigh, NC 27602  
Telephone: (919) 854-1844  
Facsimile: (919) 854-2084